

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Office Action of December 4, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Applicants hereby amend claim 10 and add new claims 20-38.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ha et al. (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0186333) in view of Korzen (U.S. Patent No. 5,699,039), Sasuga et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,282), Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,166), and Sakai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,426,784); and rejected claims 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,150) in view of Shimada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,020,867), Ueda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,412), Lee et al., and Sakai et al. The rejections of the claims are traversed and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the amendments above and in view of the following remarks.

Preliminarily, Applicants note that Ha et al. (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0186333), Korzen (U.S. Patent No. 5,699,039), and Ueda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,412) were applied in rejections of the present Office Action. However, Ha et al., Korzen, and Ueda et al. were not listed in the "Notice of References Cited" mailed with the present Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner formally cite the Ha et al., Korzen, and Ueda et al. references within a "Notice of References Cited".

Further, Applicants note that the Office Action Summary of the present Office Action fails to indicate whether the action is Final or is Non-Final (i.e., neither box 2a) nor 2b) is checked). Given that Lee et al. and Sakai et al. were applied in the present Office Action and

not in any previous Office Action, and given the lack of indication in the “Conclusion” section of the present Office Action to the contrary, Applicants hereby assume the Examiner intended to issue the present Office Action as a Non-Final Action.

The rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ha et al. in view of Korzen, Sasuga et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over Ha et al. in view of Korzen, Sasuga et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al. in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example “an inverter... a case... and at least one bracket arranged on a bottom surface of the case for connecting the inverter to the case.” Neither Ha et al., Korzen, Sasuga et al., Lee et al., nor Sakai et al., singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-6, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable over Ha et al. in view of Korzen, Sasuga et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al.

Claim 7 is allowable over Ha et al. in view of Korzen, Sasuga et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al. in that claim 7 recites a combination of elements including, for example “a case... and a bracket arranged on the case, wherein the bracket comprises: an inverter part; and a case part; wherein the inverter is arranged on the inverter part.” Neither Ha et al., Korzen, Sasuga et al., Lee et al., nor Sakai et al., singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 and 9, which depend from claim 7, are also allowable over Ha et al. in view of Korzen, Sasuga et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al.

Claim 10 is allowable over Ha et al. in view of Korzen, Sasuga et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al. in that claim 10 recites a combination of elements including, for example “a case... a first and a second bracket arranged on the case; wherein the first bracket includes an inverter part and a case part; and wherein the inverter is arranged on the inverter part.” Neither Ha et al., Korzen, Sasuga et al., Lee et al., nor Sakai et al., singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11 and 12, which depend from claim 10, are also allowable over Ha et al. in view of Korzen, Sasuga et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al.

The rejection of 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Shimada et al., Ueda et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 13 is allowable over Kim in view of Shimada et al., Ueda et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al. in that claim 13 recites a combination of elements including, for example “an inverter... a case... a bracket arranged on the case, wherein the bracket comprises: an inverter part; and a case part; wherein the inverter is arranged on the inverter part.” Neither Kim, Shimada et al., Ueda et al., Lee et al., nor Sakai et al., singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14, which depends from claim 13, is also allowable over Kim in view of Shimada et al., Ueda et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al.

Claim 15 is allowable over Kim in view of Shimada et al., Ueda et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al. in that claim 15 recites a combination of elements including, for example “a case... a first and a second bracket connected to the case; wherein the first bracket includes an inverter part and a case part; and wherein the inverter is attached to the inverter part.”

Application No.: 10/026,482
Group Art Unit: 2826
Amendment filed March 4, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.519.00

Neither Kim, Shimada et al., Ueda et al., Lee et al., nor Sakai et al., singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16 and 17, which depend from claim 15, are also allowable over Kim in view of Shimada et al., Ueda et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al.

Claim 18 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 18 recites a combination of elements including, for example “an inverter... a case... a bracket connected to the case, wherein the bracket comprises: an inverter part; and a case part; wherein the inverter is attached to the inverter part.” Neither Kim, Shimada et al., Ueda et al., Lee et al., nor Sakai et al., singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19, which depends from claim 18, is also allowable over Kim in view of Shimada et al., Ueda et al., Lee et al., and Sakai et al.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to point out where, in any of the applied references, a bracket, as set forth in the claims above, is disclosed.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

Application No.: 10/026,482
Group Art Unit: 2826
Amendment filed March 4, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.519.00

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 4, 2004

for By Valerie P. Hayes 53,005
Kurt M. Eaton
Registration No: 51,640
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE, LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone No.: (202) 496-7500
Facsimile No.: (202) 496-7756

Application No.: 10/026,482
Group Art Unit: 2826
Amendment filed March 4, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.519.00

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 4, 2004

By Valerie P. Hayes Reg No. 53,005
for Kurt M. Eaton
Registration No: 51,640
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE, LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone No.: (202) 496-7500
Facsimile No.: (202) 496-7756